

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration. Claims 9, 10, 14, and 15 have been withdrawn.

Amendment

A more descriptive title has been provided. Moreover, claims 1 and 11-15 have been amended to improve their form, without narrowing the scope of the claims. In this respect, the preamble of claims 11-15 has been revised to better conform to U.S. patent practice, namely embodying a computer program in a computer-readable medium. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1-3, 6-8, and 11-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ikeno (USP 7,154,617) in view of Holmstead (USPGP 2004/0024844). Applicant traverses this rejection because the combination urged by the examiner, even if it were deemed proper for argument's sake would not have taught preventing downloading of resources when a print job currently exists in a storage device, as set forth in independent claims 1, 6, and 11.

Each of independent claims 1, 6, and 11 sets forth the feature of determining, when a download start request for resource data has been received from one of a plurality of information processing apparatuses, whether a print job received from at least one of the plurality of information processing apparatuses exists in the storage device. When the received print job exists in the storage device, these claims set forth the feature of informing one of the plurality of information processing apparatuses that downloading of the resource data is not possible.

The examiner recognizes that Ikeno does not disclose or teach preventing downloading of resource data when a print job exists in a storage device. The examiner thus relied upon Holmstead's Fig. 4 for the proposition that allowing resource data to be downloaded only when no print job exists in a storage device.

In contrast to the examiner's assessment, however, Holmstead merely discloses matching the print job elements (such as photos or images) for the current print job with previously stored print job elements. If there is no match, Holmstead calls for downloading the print job elements for the current print job. Otherwise, the stored print job elements are retrieved from a storage device for the current job. Holmstead's Fig. 4 has nothing to do with

whether a print job currently exists in a storage device. Holmstead rather merely discloses using the resources that exist in its storage device instead of downloading them to expedite the printing processing.

Accordingly, applicant submits that the combination, even if it were deemed proper for argument's sake, would not have disclosed or taught preventing downloading of resources when a print job currently exists in a storage device, as set forth in independent claims 1, 6, and 11.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that claims 1-3, 6-8, and 11-13 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

09 AUGUST 2008

DATE

/Lyle Kimms 080908/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. No. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826  
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826  
703-726-6020 (PHONE)  
703-726-6024 (FAX)